UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

IN RE: . Case No. 08-35653(KRH)

•

CIRCUIT CITY STORES . 701 East Broad Street

INC., Richmond, VA 23219

Debtor.

. January 9, 2009

. 1:05 a.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

BEFORE HONORABLE KEVIN R. HUENNEKENS UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Debtor: McGuireWoods, LLP

By: DOUGLAS FOLEY, ESQ. 900 World Trade Center

101 W. Main St. Norfolk, VA 23510

Skadden Arps Slate Meagher & Flom, LLP

By: GREGG M. GALARDI

One Rodney Sq.

Wilmington, DE 19899

For the Creditors

Committee:

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones By: ROBERT FEINSTEIN, ESQ. 10100 Santa Monica Boulevard

11th Floor

Los Angeles, CA 90067

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC. 268 Evergreen Avenue Hamilton, New Jersey 08619 E-mail: jjcourt@optonline.net

(609)586-2311 Fax No. (609)587-3599

APPEARANCES (CONT'D):

Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll For Central

By: DAVID POLLACK, ESQ. Properties Group;

Various Landlords: 51st Floor

1735 Market Street

Philadelphia, PA 19103-7599

For Developers Kelley Drye & Warren Diversified; By: ROBERT LeHANE, ESQ.

Various Landlords 101 Park Avenue

New York, NY 10178-0002

For Bear Valley Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory &

Partners; Natsis LLP

By: IVAN GOLD, ESQ. Various West Coast

Landlords Three Embarcadero Center 12th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94111

For the Secured KATHERINE MILLER, ESO.

Lenders:

For Savitri Cohen: Christian & Barton, LLP

By: MICHAEL MUELLER, ESQ.

909 East Main Street

Suite 1200

Richmond, VA 21219

For 50212 86th Street; Troutman Sanders

Various Landlords: By: SHEILA deLa CRUZ, ESQ.

1660 International Drive Suite 600

Mclean, VA 22102

For Cosmo Eastgate

Limited:

Troutman Sander

By: VIVIEON KELLEY, ESQ. JENNIFER HOOVER, ESQ.

600 Peachtree Street, NE Suite 5200

Atlanta, GA 30308-2216 (Telephonic Appearances)

For Interstate

Various Landlords:

PETER BILLOUGHS, ESQ. Augusta Properties; (Telephonic Appearance)

J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC.

2

APPEARANCES (CONT'D):

For Verizon Wireless: Blank Rome, LLP

By: REGINA STANGO KELBON, ESQ.

One Logan Square

130 North 18th Street Philadelphia, PA 19103 (Telephonic Appearance)

For Douglas County,

Douglas County Attorney's Office

Colorado: By: ROBERT CLARK, ESQ.

100 Third Street Castle Rock, CO 80104 (Telephonic Appearance)

For Brookline Development:

Hancock & Estabrook By: JOHN CLARK, ESQ.

1500 AXA Tower I 100 Madison Street

Syracuse, New York 13202 (Telephonic Appearance)

For Faber Brothers,

Inc.:

DAVID DEAN, ESQ.

(Telephonic Appearance)

For E.L. McGee, LLC: Howard Rice

By: GARY KAPLAN, ESQ.

3 Embarcadero Center, 7th Floor

San Francisco CA 94111 (Telephonic Appearance)

J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC.

3

THE CLERK: All rise. The United States Bankruptcy
Court for the Eastern District of Virginia is now in session.
The Honorable Kevin R. Huennekens presiding. Please be seated and come to order.

THE COURT CLERK: In the matter of Circuit City Stores, Incorporated.

MR. FOLEY: Good afternoon, Doug Foley from McGuireWood, on behalf of debtors. We want to extend our appreciation to the Court for scheduling this hearing on short notice. We have noticed it to several thousand parties since it was filed this morning by fax and, as you will hear from the telephone participation, there's a lot of appearances to be read into the record. But, at this point, Mr. Galardi will be presenting the motion to the Court.

MR. GALARDI: Thank you. Mr. Foley. Good afternoon, Your Honor. For the record, Gregg Galardi on behalf of Circuit City. Your Honor, I think what would be helpful for the Court and for people in the courtroom to understand what we've done to come to this point, including the procedural steps that we have taken, as Your Honor is aware, we filed under seal the motion to conduct a sale process with Your Honor, on, I think it was Monday, January 5th, and it was filed under seal with the consent of the bank group who was on the call and, I think, maybe present in the courtroom as well as the committee. That wasn't the first time that either the bank group or the

committee had seen that motion nor landlords, Your Honor, at least certain landlord counsels. To get to that point, I think we had forwarded to Your Honor even a draft prior to that date, maybe Friday. We have also circulated it to the U.S. Trustee at the time we filed it. We had also met with, as Your Honor knows, the landlords, have been a very active contingency. I happen to know five or six of their counsel fairly well.

Before we ever filed the motion, we circulated a draft of that motion to their counsel to get an input from them as to how best to proceed with the procedures for what we thought would be an expedited sale process, and I say expedited only in the public sense. I'll give some detail about why it wasn't expedited coming up to this point. It's more expedited from this point on.

We sent it to the landlords. We sent it to the committee and we sent it to the bank group. And I'd say, with respect to the bank group and the committee, there are no issues as to the procedures that are currently existing after back and forth negotiations and language. It is a fully consensual procedure and dates and, simply stated, it is driven off of the January 16th date for a sale hearing. As Your Honor will recall, the last time I was before Your Honor, I believe it was December 22nd, we had filed under seal a second amendment to the DIP credit agreement. Pursuant to that DIP credit agreement in that amendment, we had agreed with the bank

group and the committee that we would file a sale motion or sale procedures motion by the January 5th date and also seek a sale hearing or a financing by the January 16th date. That was an agreement that helped resolve the issues between the committee and the bank group and so we were working towards those dates by having filed that and that was part of the resolution. The parties had also met over the holidays to decide when to make that public and when to pursue it. So this was a date that we had been looking to for January 16th with the committee since their formation.

In addition, Your Honor, just to remind everybody in the courtroom, because I think the January 16th date has had a prominence since the day that we first came in, as Your Honor may recall, the January 16th hearing was also the date by which we said, in the original DIP before it was amended, that we would have to have a subordinated financing of about \$75 million. And why we scheduled the hearing for the January 16th was that was a critical date in these cases that I think I described. We needed a bridge to somewhere, whether it be a sale, a plan of reorganization. So we have been focusing on that January 16th date and I think it's the one immovable date that we've always talked about in this court and I think, as the events have transpired in this case, the 16th is the date by which we would like to get this case set on a course for, hopefully, and what we think is encouraging, is to some sort of

going concern transaction.

Your Honor, with that, what we had also done is obviously negotiated with the landlords and I notice that there's a lot of landlord counsel on the phone. We have been in contact with the landlords and obviously we are very sympathetic and understand what the landlords' concerns are in having discussed this at length with landlord counsel, including even yesterday when we were going through these procedures.

The original procedures contemplated, for example, an assumption and assignment of contracts and leases. With our filing it on the 5th, keeping it under seal until this morning at 8:15, we understand that it is going to be next to impossible to assume and assign and fix cure amounts by the 16th. And the good news for Your Honor and the good news for the landlords who have not been sort of with what I'll call the landlord cabal that I've been dealing with and as they professionally call themselves, we have agreed that we are not going to file any sort of cure notice tomorrow to make landlords on 500 leases compute their cures, take the risk of getting that, and having an assumption and assignment.

In addition, Your Honor, we actually think we're not going to affect landlords' rights at all in the next seven days, although I can't say absolutely not. Here is where we stand on the sale process, Your Honor, and I have a

representative of FTI and a representative of Rothschild in to the extent Your Honor would want testimony or a proffer. But since the commencement of this case, Rothschild was involved as an investment banker and has been seeking solutions for the company as a going concern transaction in the form of either a financing to a vendor or third party supported plan or in the form of a sale under Section 363.

I'm pleased to say, Your Honor, that there are still, as we speak, and one of the reasons we kept this motion under seal was to try to proceed as far along as possible with two interested parties. We still have, as we stand here today, two parties that are still interested in a going concern transaction for the company which we are very hopeful could, in fact, be consummated. Realistically speaking, Your Honor, and even hearing from those bidders, it is extremely unlikely that we could consummate, file a motion to sell a company (indiscernible) billion dollars in revenue on January 16th and assume and assign all of the leases and assume and assign all of the contracts. That's just not realistic, Your Honor.

What is realistic, Your Honor, is to continue to pursue those alternatives and, to that extent, the management has made trips to outside of the country, inside of the country, to Las Vegas to meet at the Consumer Electronics meetings with the bidders and a few other electronics people, and we were still encouraged that there could still be these

two parties that may want a going concern transaction.

Though I can't say absolutely, if those transactions actually come closer and are fully negotiated or negotiated further, what I would suspect the January 16th date to be is really an interim financing hearing to get us to a bridge to a sale of a 363 or perhaps to a supported plan. So the idea is, we've set out a procedure to get going concern bids. We are hopeful that we will have two such bids but not in the form of, we might think, fully vetted asset purchase agreement, all of those terms, leases to be assumed, contracts to be assumed, everything to be dealt with.

Given that that's the reality, and I say this for the landlords' benefit, it is extremely unlikely that I'll move to a full and final lease in that context. What's more likely is we'd come in with some financing to bridge one, two, three, four weeks, to be able to consummate it and deal with all the lease issues, the cure issues, the adequate assurance issues, at a future hearing. That's one scenario that we've been going over and we're very hopeful of that scenario.

The other scenario, Your Honor, as FTI would testify to, is, look, if there is no alternative, then there's the inventory and, again, landlords are concerned about that. What normally concerns them is what concerns them with the 155 stores. What are going to be the procedures? What are the guidelines? What are the store closing guidelines? Again,

they have been circulated. We would continue to circulate those to the landlords. But that becomes a hearing, at best, on the 16th about sale guidelines. It's not assumption assignment. It's not cure, unfortunately. It's one of those solutions.

So we think, again, focusing on that 16th date, that is a very doable deadline and we have been soliciting and giving bid packages out to third parties to make us a proposal for that. There would be an auction that we propose the 13th and 14th, whether it's going concern or miscellaneous assets. We think that is a realistic time line but I don't think that affects landlords other than sale guidelines which we have made and can make available with agency agreements and they've actually been standard. Your Honor has approved and the only real key is, in this instance, if you're really going out of business, you might add that phrase. But, for the most part, those are fairly standard procedures and we think we could resolve all of those issues by the 16th.

So the only way that I think that landlords and contract parties may be affected is -- and there is interest in this and it's also encouraging -- it is quite possible that some buyers could want to buy a market or two markets or three markets. And if that were the case, it could present us with an assumption and assignment issue on the 16th. The good news is that the company did decide that, in this context, knowing

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

full well where we were, we've paid January rent, so that takes the pressure off of the 16th on those issues. If a bidder comes in and it's not identified yet, we can let landlords know.

I won't comment on the environment other than to say that I believe the landlords would love nothing more than an adequate assurance fight on this and have their leases taken in such circumstances and that leaves the cure issue. And what we've decided to do is, if we do get such a bid on the 13th or 14th and we give the landlords notice of that bid, and we would pick off the landlords, then we'd say, go ahead and file your cure amount. We'll determine -- we'll take the burden to say it's right or not right. Let the buyers know. And if we have a fight, we can put it off for another day. If we had an adequate assurance fight and you really want to fight that, that can be put off for another day very rapidly within the next two weeks. But if you're convinced that you want this person and it's really just a dispute over the cure where we'll pay the undisputed amount and we'll go forward on a fight if we want to, unless the buyer doesn't want to do that. But that's something I think we're going to have to manage between the 13th and the 16th and I think, at least our track record in this case, is that we'll be able to manage that even though we may have 500 objections. We probably can resolve that.

And the idea was, with respect to the bid procedures,

2.4

is for us to delete and the landlords who are in the courtroom have helped us with this, is delete the provision saying we're going to file a cure notice because no matter what notice we file, we know we're going to be inaccurate. In some sense, they're going to have estimates from year ends. It's just not worth the paper damage that it will do to this court in seven days so we've said, let's not do that. Let's first see if somebody is bidding on a lease, then we'll take the burden to notify those people with the leases. They can choose to file a cure amount. They can choose not to file a cure amount. We could choose to have an adequate assurance, we could choose not to. And when we get here on the 16th, I will bet that we will be able to resolve any issues and punt most of the issues that we need to punt.

So I think when you boil down what the relief is that we're asking for today, is really simply three days or three dates that go into four. One, Your Honor, and it's going to seem odd, but we would like to set an initial bid deadline of tomorrow at five o'clock for bids on assets. The reason that we think that is an appropriate date, Your Honor, is first, as I've mentioned, Rothschild has notified bidders in the world who are interested in going concern or other piecemeal transactions that tomorrow is a date. It's done so for the last month or so, at least. Two, we've notified, what I'll call the liquidation community, of that date and, three,

we've actually talked to, what I'll call the one-off pocket bidders, of that date. So we think that to set that date at least gets us a grounding in what these bids are, to see if we're having bids, and how to put hopefully multiple permutations together for the greatest value for this estate.

Obviously, if we don't get those bids, and it's set forth in the motion, in consultation with the committee and with our fiduciary obligation to maximize value, we can let those dates slip. We can talk to parties and encourage them to bid and indeed, Your Honor, up until such time at the end of the auction or before your Court approves it, we'll always consider higher and better bids. I'm not asking anybody to do that because it is important to have a process to go through this process. So we'd like to set that initial bid deadline.

To the extent -- and I know our going concern bidders are not going to have that deadline tomorrow. We'll entertain and continue with proposals with them through the weekend, through Monday, through Tuesday. So the first deadline is the initial deadline. The second deadline is a date to commence an auction in New York at our offices which would be the 13th of this month and we schedule two days. Hopefully, we'll have an auction. A lot of that time, if Your Honor has been to auctions, you spend the first day negotiating. You have one page on the docket and you're out seven hours and we always pay the court reporter by the hour because, if you pay them by the

page like they normally make, they'd never make any money.

So we figure we'll have that on the 13th and 14th.

We've given ourselves a day breathing spell in case it actually spilled into the 15th and we'd like to come back to Your Honor on the 16th. At bottom, that's really all this motion is asking for, is a time table. We think the time table is fair.

We don't think it prejudices or deprives anybody of any property rights and clearly, Your Honor, we gave only notice to a select group of people. We gave two thousand by fax or e-mail today.

If anyone has an objection to the due process nature of this or to the sale of the assets or the impairment of their property rights, all rights are reserved for the 16th. No one is trying to prejudice them or to say they can't have those rights or to argue otherwise. This was really to set a process that's actually been in motion in a public forum now to get to the 16th.

Again, if I were a betting man, it would seem to be we will hopefully have some sort of financing transaction with one of those bidders to further this process for a going concern. That is the company's hope, that we are encouraged by the discussions. That is our hope. Otherwise, it'll be the inventory or pocket bids and then we'll have a little bit more work to do on the 16th. But I'm encouraged by the two going concern bidders.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, landlords often ask, and I'll put it on the record and hopefully -- I know there's lots of them in here -do I have -- can I bid on my lease, do I have to show up at the Okay. So let's take those issues first. If you want to bid on your lease, please feel free to do so. All we would ask for is a letter by January 12th and that's simply to coordinate our knowledge of whether or not they want to bid. It is possible, for example, that we get somebody to bid for 70 stores and a few leases and, if you put all this together, you might get maximum value. We'd like to know if a landlord wants to bid. Most likely, if we get ten, 15 of those, 20 of those, it's not going to be enough to carry the value of this company and we'd like to be then able to give them notice that there will be no sale of your lease at this period of time; you need not be involved in more. The sooner you get us a letter of your interest, the sooner we can tell you whether you need to come to an auction or not.

The second thing is, do you have to attend. Every landlord is entitled to attend the auction. My conference room in New York cannot handle that so we're going to open up a telephone line that -- we'll give a conference call. We'll post it. There will be a call-in line so that they can participate in the auction, so they can stay in their office and not have to stay in our conference room for the eight hours or whatever time it is to negotiate. Landlords are entitled to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

vote. So, I think, fundamentally, one, no adequate assurance fights do we believe will go forward on the 16th; two, no cure motion has to be filed, a cure statement has to be, unless they want to; three, if we get a bid for a lease, we'll give that landlord specific notice of the bid and how we're going to go through with that process. We would encourage any buyer of leases to work through that process; four, we think that we can get landlords to the end of the month because we've already paid them January rent so it will be really an issue between us and the buyer as to when you would assume that, whether you want the inventory in that store and all those things so I think we're not going to prejudice the landlords; five, they can show up and bid on their leases. All we'd ask is prior notice; we're not going to hold onto that but it helps us to assess whether they should come or not. Give us a letter by the 12th at 5 p.m., an e-mail to myself or Mr. Fredericks; and, six, they're all invited to the auction. We'd ask them to take telephone appearances unless they want to really sit in the conference room in New York which we hope not to pay for under their leases so we'd ask them to stay on the telephone. With that, Your Honor, I think -- I'm not asking for

With that, Your Honor, I think -- I'm not asking for much other than that, from Your Honor, other than an approval of that sort of time line and procedure to give Your Honor the idea that we are, in fact, very hopeful that we can pull off a going concern transaction and looking forward to trying to get

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the financing necessary to carry us to be able to consummate such a transaction.

I don't know if Your Honor had any questions about There's a lot of words but, again, there's a the procedures. termination fee, Your Honor, that we often talk about. general position is that, since I'm asking for it in advance as opposed to when I have a stalking horse, it's open game for the Court to approve it or ratify our decision. It would only be a decision to ratify should we get it and I think it's going to be very unlikely here. But if the committee and we, and the banks agree that it really is good to start this auction with one bidder as opposed to another, in this sort of inventory process, this could very well be the case. Then let's start with a floor contract and then we'd come back and show why we thought it was wise in hindsight. We just would like to have the discretion. It sometimes fleshes out better fundamental bids but we would put on the evidence on the 16th. Should we decide to do that, the committee will have all rights to object. The banks would have all rights to object. Any party would have a right to object. But we thought it would be good to have the authority so that when we are negotiating these contracts over the next few days, we can say, yes, we think it's worthwhile to have this form of contract.

Other than that, I can't anticipate granting a break-up fee at this point in time. That's the only other

standard but non-standard provision that we're asking for, Your Honor. I would turn the podium over, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. FEINSTEIN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Robert Feinstein, Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones, lead counsel for the committee. Briefly, Your Honor, I can confirm Mr. Galardi's presentation, that what you see today in terms of process is really the tip of the iceberg in that we have been at this 24/7 for the last several weeks. The committee has been intimately involved in the development of the procedures. I believe the banks have as well. And there has been some pursuit of a sale process and the committee endorsed the filing of the motion under seal and, where we are today, we are hopeful as well. We'll take matters as they come and certainly we support the relief that's been requested today and we'll see what happens in the coming week or ten days.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Feinstein.

MR. POLLACK: Good afternoon, Your Honor. David Pollack, Ballard Spahr, on behalf of Central Properties Group and various other landlords noted of record. Your Honor, I guess we now have a name, that we are now the landlord cabal. I think I like that better than what one of your colleagues once referred to us as, the whining landlords. I think cabal is a little bit better.

THE COURT: We would never say that in this court.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. POLLACK: No, no. What Mr. Galardi has described is very accurate. He has -- and I said this to him earlier today. He previously bared himself pretty completely to Judge Sanchie this morning in a matter, so I didn't know there was anything left but, you know, I won't turn around and check. has been very forthright with the landlords. He did invite our comments starting on January the 2nd. We were able to see the pleadings that they had intended. We had input into those pleadings, input into this order. He and Mr. Fredericks have kept us advised of the various dates because they have been, as Your Honor knows, a moving target. My colleague and fellow cabal member, Mr. Gold, unfortunately flew in from San Francisco for yesterday's hearing but now one extra day in Richmond is fine. Mr. LeHane, Mr. Branch, Mr. Epps and his colleagues, all participated in these things and I think Your Honor knows from the prior hearings that, among those landlords, there is a very large number of the debtor's stores. I don't know whether it's a third or a half or whatever among So we have been involved in the process. have input in it, a number of the things that Mr. Galardi addressed such as the cure issues, and we spent some time talking about, you know, what nonsense it would be to file all these pleadings and everything, and we did very easily work to an end to get here today and for these procedures.

As he indicated, and I can't speak for the other

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

landlords, but I know I've talked to my clients and I think the phrase we were using was the unfortunate homeless person on Union Square in San Francisco who agreed to pay twenty-five cents for the lease might be sufficient to prove adequate assurance. But we'll leave that evidentiary burden for another day, depending upon who the actual proposed assignees are.

Everybody has reserved all rights. We know that if we get here on the 16th and things have changed, we have reserved our rights to say we need more time and Mr. Galardi obviously has his rights to go forward but getting to the 16th, I think, we are all okay. There are some things that need to be changed in the order because the order having been filed on the 5th contemplated some things. We had been discussing, you know, cure issues based on our earlier discussions and some things that are in the order that was filed on the 5th are not things that Mr. Galardi has represented to the Court today. can work through that with Mr. Galardi and Mr. Fredericks for submission of the final order. And I think that his representations on the record today are really the things that take precedence over anything that's in an order -- in the order, as sort of a final determination because he has represented accurately where we stand on cure, where we stand on bidding, and all of those other things.

So nobody wants to be in the position of potentially losing all of these stores for any reason. We're hopeful that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

there will be a going concern bidder and, if we have fights, we'll worry about those another day. But from a process standpoint and from the procedures orders standpoint, we think that the debtor is in the right place today. We are reserving our rights. I don't think we'll get to those fights based upon the cooperation to date but we're prepared to have the Court enter the order. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Very good. Thank you, Mr. Pollack. Any other party wish to be heard?

MR. LeHANE: Good morning, Your Honor. Robert Lehane, Kelley Drye and Warren, on behalf of Developers Diversified, a member of the committee, landlord of 50 locations and a number of other landlords. I don't want to take too much time, I think. I absolutely agree with everything Mr. Pollack said. I commend Mr. Galardi for making every effort to bring us into the loop and put together a set of procedures with our cooperation that, to the extent possible, alleviated our concerns. It's not a perfect world. We understand there's a possibility we'll have some issues on the 16th and everybody has reserved their rights. Some of our clients may want to move forward with some issues and Gregg may have some people that he wants to move forward with a sale process that may require assumption and assignment. As Mr. Pollack indicated, if that's the case, our clients will probably be very happy in most instances to have a tenant

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

that's going to take over a location that would otherwise be closed.

And being a member of the committee, we were also very involved in the process and are aware of the confidentiality issues and we understand that there are many landlords out there that weren't involved in the process or landlord counsel that weren't involved in the process and they're getting this on very short notice. And we are sensitive to that issue and understand the difficulty that representing landlords and these landlords themselves or the business people have decisions to make and have to report back to other people and that makes life very difficult and it's difficult sometimes turn around on a dime and disseminate this information. But, at the same time, very mindful of the need to keep this information confidential until today in order to maximize revenues for all members of the estate and we think that this really is the best possible set of procedures we could have.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Any other party wish to be heard?

MR. GOLD: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Ivan Gold from Allen Matkins. I represent Bear Valley Road Partners and a number of other of the West Coast landlords. I want to first thank Mr. Galardi and Mr. Fredericks and also Mr. Foley for the work over the last week and managing a difficult situation and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

then being able to put this together this morning. One of the things we have asked for and I thank the Court for was the opportunity for those who didn't have a little bit of heads up to, given the circumstances, be able to listen in and participate by telephone if necessary. And I thank Mr. Foley for helping us put that together.

I join in the comments of my fellow cabal members, Mr. LeHane and Mr. Pollack. I really think it boils down to we have three scenarios and I think two of them are real straightforward. As Mr. Galardi described, we're either going to have what, in essence, would be a bridge financing motion on the 16th that would be -- that would take us to either a Section 363 sale or a plan under a schedule that we would discuss on the 16th. And we think that's quite manageable. might be in a situation where we have to deal with the approval of GOB sales if, unfortunately, a going concern bidder does not emerge. Since we're not writing on a blank slate, since you did previously approve some GOB quidelines, you know, they may need some modifications. They may need discussions. But under the circumstances, you know, we'll do our best to roll up our sleeves and get that squared away and luckily the liquidators are people we've dealt with in the past and we're confident.

It's that third transaction or third set of transactions, third scenario, that would be greater cause for concern. To use Mr. Galardi's terminology, if we had one-off

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

or pocket bidders at one end, a more piecemeal approach to the sale of assets or, as he said, you know, some maybe market based buyers of geographical pods of leases where assumption assignment is potentially an issue that presents more of a challenge. And, obviously, the debtor's payment of the January rent has taken a lot of the pressure off.

I would just emphasize and ask the Court, if we do get to that on the 16th, that certainly all parties' rights are reserved, I would just urge Your Honor to be procedurally flexible, understanding, sympathetic. Maybe our evidentiary standards are going to be a little light that day in terms of, you know -- you know, I say this coming from the West Coast and obviously, you know, Circuit City has stores all throughout the country. You know, it's not easy to get people to Richmond. You know, it's fine once you get here but getting here sometimes can be a challenge, particularly from the West Coast. And, you know, in terms of being able to get access to the decision makers, you know, on what could be important decisions, and I agree with the prior counsel that there's no question in many, most, and perhaps virtually all circumstances, people that might emerge may be perfectly acceptable but somebody has still got to know who they are in the limited amount of time.

So, you know, I'd be optimistic. We may even do some things consensually on the 16th if we do get to that third

scenario. But if we don't, you know, we're going to have to figure out a path that works, you know, in the remaining days of January. And, you know, I just wanted to emphasize and I guess an early plea to Your Honor if we get to that scenario but I hope we don't and I thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you very much, Mr. Gold.

MS. MILLER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Katherine Miller on behalf of the Secured Lenders. The lenders support the debtor's motion, and while I'd like to confirm that the lender's preference is for the discussed deadlines and the credit agreement does have the requirements set forth in the motion, the lenders have been engaged in discussions with the debtor to possibly extend the time periods if there is a sale transaction reasonably possible. But the debtors (sic) are acting in good faith with the debtor -- excuse me, the lenders are acting in good faith with the debtors. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

MR. MUELLER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Michael Mueller with the law firm of Christian & Barton, on behalf of several landlords. We also were part of the cabal landlord group and were involved in the discussions with debtor's counsel, creditors committee, and lenders with respect to the procedures and, as my colleagues have indicated, all thanks to everyone for working hard throughout the weekend and so forth.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

very much.

I do have one thing that I need to clarify with respect to landlord bids. Mr. Galardi has commented that -- I believe he said that he would like landlords to indicate by letter on the 12th that they're interested in bidding, and if that is the case, some of my clients have no problem with that. However, we do not want to be have to be required to submit our actual bid until the auction. The landlords that are interested in bidding, the procedures originally called for them to indicate so by tomorrow at five o'clock with their bid broken down into what was going to be the cash portion and what was going to be the credit bid portion. And I think we can live with indicating our interest in bidding on the 12th, by letter by the 12th, but do not want to have to actually disclose what our bid is going to be until the actual auction like all other parties. And I just would like to clarify that. Other than that, I don't believe we have any problems with the procedures. MR. GALARDI: Your Honor, we have no objection as long as they identify the property. I mean, I'd love to know what the value is but if they're not prepared to do that, that's fine, as long as I know the property so I know what's covered. I'd appreciate that. THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. MUELLER: We can do that, Your Honor.

2.4

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Mueller.

MS. deLa CRUZ: Good afternoon. Sheila deLa Cruz for 50212 86th Street, LLC and other landlords that are of record. I understand Mr. Galardi's comments and appreciate that all rights are reserved, especially for landlords who feel that their rights may be impaired by this motion and auction procedures. I do still want to raise a limited objection at this time, and will probably have to raise it in the future, with regard to the proposed process of paying disputed portions of the cure amounts. Just merely saying that the disputed cure amounts will hopefully at some point be resolved and paid later if they turn out to be legitimate cure amounts does not provide my clients adequate assurance that their legitimate cure claims will be paid.

My clients have requested that if there is a possibility of a disputed cure amount that the Court require that that amount of funds which are disputed, be escrowed and then, if it is later found to be a legitimate cure amount, then the escrowed funds would subsequently be paid to my clients.

THE COURT: I don't need to decide that today. You reserve your right to --

MS. deLa CRUZ: And it's really just noting it for the record and reserving that specific right.

THE COURT: Okay. That right certainly is reserved.

MS. deLA CRUZ: Right. But I do appreciate Mr.

2.4

Galardi's efforts to try and protect the landlord's right at this time.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Does any other party in the courtroom wish to be heard?

(Pause)

THE COURT: All right. Does any party that is participating by telephone wish to be heard?

MS. KELLEY: Yes, Your Honor. This is Vivieon Kelley of Troutman Sanders appearing on behalf of Cosmo Eastgate Limited, Northcliff Residual Parcel 4, LLC. Also on the phone with me is Jennifer Hoover representing those entities. We also -- my firm also represents a number of other landlords and we would be some of the landlords on the outer fringes of the cabal, it appears.

We've not been participating in the process up to this point and, while we certainly recognize all the work that has gone into this and we certainly respect the desire as stated earlier of counsel to prevent the needless filing of documents with this Court, we'd just like to receive some sort of confirmation of those leases that are intended to be included in the process. We do represent some lessors whose leases should have been rejected at the end of last year and other to maintain ongoing leases. And so we just would like to insure exactly where we stand as we go into this process so that we know whether or not we do, in fact, need to submit a

letter expressing an intent to bid on the 12th.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

THE COURT: All right, Ms. Kelley. Thank you. Galardi, I would assume that all leases that have not been 4 heretofore rejected are included.

MR. GALARDI: Correct, Your Honor, and I think there's an order that said they were -- the ones that were sort of liquidated were rejected effective December 31st. So if you're not subject to an order and it hasn't otherwise terminated, you're subject to open to the going concern purchaser.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Ms. Kelley, does that address your concern?

MS. KELLEY: We certainly understand that. We'd just like to see a schedule so that we know that we're all on the same page.

THE COURT: Well, it's already gone out. If your lease has been rejected, then you're on that schedule. If your lease has not been rejected, then you can assume that you are part of this process. Does that --

MS. HOOVER: Your Honor, this is Jennifer Hoover. am co-counsel with Vivieon Kelley. I do believe there was some miscommunication and there are two pleadings, I think, slightly ambiguous with regard to specifically which closing store location leases are, in fact, rejected which is why we're urging a complete designation of what leases are part of this

process.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: The closing store leases?

MR. GALARDI: Your Honor, I guess it's whether the glass is half empty or half full. If you are subject to a motion that says you were rejected, you are not included. don't have a list of all those that are not subject. I haven't published a list. Obviously, if I get to an auction or I get to a sale, we're going to have to give specific notice to those parties. So I think a simple way that we're trying to do it is if you received a notice either that you were rejected already -- I think there may even be some pending construction leases that are being rejected -- anybody who has received a notice that the lease has been rejected, those leases are not covered. Everything else, every contract that's not been rejected, every lease that's not been rejected, is subject to a bid if people want to bid on it. We've not listed every contract. I guess you could go to the schedules and sort of do it yourself and see it but we didn't think it was necessary for this purpose.

THE COURT: Nor do I. I think it's perfectly clear.

If your lease has not been rejected, then it's part of this process and I don't think that that's necessary. Is there anybody else on the phone that wishes to be heard?

MR. BILLOUGHS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Peter Billoughs on behalf of Ray Mucci, Interstate Augusta

Properties, and other landlords. I, too, and my clients have

2.4

not been part of the discussions with the debtors and the committee so this is the first time I'm hearing about it. I think what's necessary is that, and I would think that debtor's counsel is going to do this, but circulating a revised order. Obviously, there are significant changes to what was proposed in the motion that was filed this morning and I'm still a little bit unclear about when debtor's counsel says that all rights are reserved when -- when rights are reserved until. Are those issues going to be, other than, say, cure, are issues of adequate assurance and the suitability of prospective tenants, is that going to be the subject of the hearing next Friday or is that going to be something that we are going to agree to deal with that at a later date?

The other thing is I'm not sure it's clear on the record today when the notice date would be for prospective purchasers because I understand that the auction may go as long as the day before the hearing and, although there may be some landlord counsel and other folks that are privy to the -- more privy to discussions with what's going on, we haven't been up to this date, so if we can get that cleared up, that there will be some formal process for getting notice to all landlords about prospective purchasers and when. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Billoughs.

MR. GALARDI: Your Honor, I think -- let's be as blunt as possible. All rights are reserved on all issues until

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the 16th. I think what we have laid out in spades is, if I have a going concern bidder, it's most likely going to be a financing transaction so no rights will even be decided on the 16th. If I go forward on an inventory bid, then the only rights that will be really decided on the 16th are what the procedures say with respect to store closings. And the only thing I can't absolutely say at this point is that if I get some bidder that wants eight or ten leases as a going concern, your rights are reserved to, one, challenge that I haven't given you due process and sufficient time to give you notice to bring your witness here to argue adequate assurance. Your rights are preserved to argue cure. Your rights are argued to ask for an adjournment of that hearing. All those rights are reserved until I try to do something affirmative and I haven't tried to do anything affirmative yet other than schedule a hearing today.

With respect to the prospective purchaser notice, again, Your Honor, since the 10th would have been the deadline, I would have hoped to give notice as soon as the 11th but I'm going to be realistic. What I think is it's most likely going to happen that these could dribble and drab in. I'm hoping that I get a 10th -- as soon as I get a notice, within six hours we'll get to the landlords or post something. I would say that any notice by the morning of, let's say, 11 o'clock on the 13th before I commence an auction will be the last notice I

give because I should have all bids unless somebody shows up at an auction. I would say we'll post any notice of any bids with respect to any leases no later than 11 a.m. on the morning of the 13th. I'll try to do it by 5 p.m. on the 12th if at all possible, if I have all that information. And maybe that's -- you know what? I think it's probably better now that I've convinced myself. Let's say we'll post it by 7 p.m. on the evening of the 12th. That way, if somebody really is upset and they want to come to New York for an auction or appear at the hearing, they'll know. They can look at the docket at 7 p.m. on the 12th and, anything we know at that point with respect to any leases, we will post a notice of those leases that people have shown an interest that they want to purchase. I think that's a simple way to try to deal with the notice of purchaser deadline.

THE COURT: All right. Very good. Does any other party on the phone wish to be heard?

MS. KELBON: Yes, Your Honor. Your Honor, good afternoon. This is Regina Stango Kelbon from Blank Rome on behalf of Celco Partnership doing business as Verizon Wireless.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. I didn't get your name. If you could repeat that, please?

MS. KELBON: I said good afternoon, Your Honor. This is Regina Stango Kelbon from Blank Rome on behalf of Celco Partnership doing business as Verizon Wireless.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. KELBON: Your Honor, Verizon Wireless appreciates the debtor's financial predicament and issues in this case. As Your Honor may recall, Verizon Wireless operates a Verizon Wireless store within a store. In that regard, Verizon does have important concerns in this case. Verizon Wireless has approximately 2,000 of its own employees operating the stores within a store in over 545 locations. So, to insure an orderly process, Verizon needs to be informed as to the plan for each store as Verizon has to effectuate plans for its 2,000 employees. So, to aid in this smooth liquidation, Verizon needs advance notice and opportunity to plan not only, first and foremost, for its employees but there are other issues. It has to remove its highly proprietary trademarks and signage.

At the initial 154 store closings, Verizon was able to work out in an orderly fashion to remove its kiosks and signage at each of the stores that closed in the initial wave and we just want to make sure that Circuit City has someone available to work with Verizon Wireless to address this issue as well. You know, thirdly, Verizon has to remove its inventory which is locked up and apart from Circuit City in an orderly fashion.

Therefore, Your Honor, we request that the debtors inform Verizon of their intended course of action so that the parties can coordinate an orderly exit from each of these

locations if that becomes necessary and be permitted to observe the auction and that any purchasers may be aware of Verizon's rights in its inventory. Since we didn't have advance notice of this, Your Honor, we're just concerned about making sure that we are kept in the loop and informed because we are particularly concerned of our employees.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. GALARDI: Your Honor, first, Ms. Kelbon can send me an e-mail and we'll try to get her a point person, as she said we coordinated on the one fifty-five. Your Honor, two, she keeps using the liquidation word. I think they hope and we hope we have a going concern which will alleviate this and, as I said, we have two active parties so I really want to emphasize that. We are hopeful about that.

With respect to her attending the auction, again, she can attend the auction in person, on the phone, however she wants to. And the bidders have all been aware, as she's made clear from the very first day, Verizon has kiosks. We all know it. We understand that their equipment is locked. We heard about that the first day. And we'll keep them posted and hopefully Verizon will help us succeed with a going concern bid.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Galardi.

MS. KELBON: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Anybody else on the phone

wish to be heard?

MR. CLARK: Yes, Your Honor. This is Robert Clark,
Assistant Douglas County Attorney. This is Douglas County,
Colorado. We have a secured property tax claim and our
objection is a very limited one.

When the order approving the sale is issued, we'd like a clause in there saying that valid pre-petition liens attach to the proceeds as required under Section 363(e).

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Clark, I think that's appropriate for a sales order but this is just a procedure at this point to get us to that kind of an order.

MR. CLARK: Well, I was a little bit uncertain as to the correct time to express that concern so I figured I'd jump on the wagon as soon as I could.

THE COURT: And I think that that's good. Express it often and we'll make sure that all rights of lien creditors are observed.

MR. GALARDI: And, Your Honor, no fault of the gentleman, I mean, we do have proposed sale orders in there. So when and if we're submitting a sale order, we're well aware. I'm sure we'll have Texas and I'm sure we'll have all the states come in and jump on that bandwagon so we'll keep it in mind when we submit a sale order.

MR. CLARK: We appreciate that. Thank you.

THE COURT: Anyone else on the phone wish to be

heard?

MR. CLARK: Your Honor, my name is John Clark. I'm with Hancock & Estabrook. I represent Brookline Development. I have a question regarding the landlord's bid procedure with respect to its own lease. Whether or not a landlord wishes to bid on its lease may be influenced by whether or not any third parties express any interest. And if the landlords have to indicate their interest by 5 o'clock and third parties by later than that, it may put the landlords at a disadvantage.

MR. GALARDI: Your Honor, again, if I'm giving notice of prospective purchasers and landlords want to hold it until after that, I don't really have a problem. I'm just trying to coordinate a process.

MR. CLARK: I understand. So a landlord wouldn't necessarily be precluded from bidding if he doesn't submit his letter of interest by five o'clock on the 12th?

MR. GALARDI: If you want to make a defensive bid because you don't like a third party purchaser, be my guest after the deadline, after the notice. That's the only thing I can see why that would be affected for this particular party. I understood why they didn't want to put an amount in. They didn't want to get locked into a bid if nobody's bidding. Now, they just don't want to get locked up with a third party.

After the 7 o'clock notice, if a landlord wants to tell us now that, I see somebody, I'm now interested, that's fine, Your

1 I think we can be very flexible in this process. Honor. 2 not had a problem before. 3 THE COURT: All right. Very good. 4 MR. CLARK: Thank you. That's fine. 5 THE COURT: Any other party on the phone wish to be 6 heard? 7 Yes, Your Honor. This is David Dean on MR. DEAN: 8 behalf of Faber Brothers, Inc., and I just have a brief 9 question about the 7 p.m. notice. Is that going to be posted 10 on the docket or are parties going to have to go somewhere else 11 to find this notice? 12 MR. GALARDI: Your Honor, what I will do --13 MR. DEAN: Or is it going to be served by e-mail? 14 MR. GALARDI: Your Honor, I think that e-mail is going to be very difficult because I don't have everybody's 15 e-mail. What we will do is file a notice and list it on our 16 17 case CCLLC website where we post our pleadings. That will be 18 posted by 7 p.m. so people usually can have access to that and 19 see it on those two -- those spots and that's pretty 20 instantaneous. 21 THE COURT: All right. And that's satisfactory to 22 the Court. Any other party on the phone wish to be heard? 23 MR. KAPLAN: Yes, Your Honor. This is Gary Kaplan 24 from the Howard Rice Law Firm in San Francisco. I represent

E.L. McKee, LLC, one of the landlords here in California. Now,

25

1 I have a procedural question regarding the hearings tentatively 2 scheduled for next week, January 16th. Will the Court again 3 permit out of town counsel to participate without local counsel 4 also associating with them? THE COURT: I think that, given the nature of these 5 6 proceedings and how quickly they're going, the Court is going 7 to accommodate out of state counsel by allowing them to 8 participate by telephone. 9 MR. KAPLAN: Thank you, Your Honor. I have nothing 10 further. 11 THE COURT: And there won't be any necessity for you 12 to file a separate motion asking for that. You can assume 13 right now that you can participate by phone. 14 MR. KAPLAN: Thank you very much, Your Honor. 15 assume there will be a conference call-in number that's circulated by debtor's counsel, like was done today? 16 17 THE COURT: Yes. Mr. Foley will circulate a 18 telephone number for people to call in. 19 MR. KAPLAN: Thank you, Your Honor. 20 MR. GALARDI: And we'll post a notice and put it on 21 the case CCL website for parties to find. 22 THE COURT: All right. When you post a notice, Mr. 23 Galardi, if you could include that they can participate by

MR. GALARDI: Yes, Your Honor. Those will be

24

25

telephone?

speaking lines.

THE COURT: Very good. Thank you. Does anybody else on the phone wish to be heard?

(No audible response)

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Galardi, I think that everybody has had their say. The Court has reviewed the motion and, with the clarifications you provided today, you've addressed my concerns. My most immediate one was how we were going to have a bid deadline by tomorrow. But I'm satisfied with the process that you've laid out and I hope that this is going to work. I guess, at this point, it appears to me that you want to get this order entered today.

MR. GALARDI: Your Honor, I'm -- well, I'm going to do two things that get me concerned. One, I'm okay because I think the dates are the critical thing, if Your Honor approves that. What I'd like to do, unfortunately to the 2000 people on the phone that we gave notice to, I'd like to -- if the landlords don't object, I'd like to circulate it to the landlords' counsel that are in the courtroom today to sign off on the language. I unfortunately don't want to spend the next week negotiating this order for the rest of the language. I think the record is pretty clear as to what I said and reservation of rights and everything can be construed against me on the 16th if there's an ambiguity in what I've said. I have no problem with that because I really think it's just the

dates and the reservation of rights is what we've agreed to here. But I'd like the landlords to sign off on it and, if it gets entered tomorrow, that would be fine. If we could do it today, that's great. But I just want to make sure our dates are fixed and we can start proceeding along those lines.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Galardi, the Court will fix those dates and I will look for that order. If you don't get it in today, then, you know, obviously I can enter it tomorrow. Whether it actually gets docketed by the Clerk's Office tomorrow would be a different issue.

MR. GALARDI: Oh, I'm sorry, Judge. It's Friday.

THE COURT: I know. We lose track of time. But we've all been kind of busy. The Court will enter it certainly tomorrow if you do but it may be docketed Monday morning. But that won't interfere with any of the deadlines or anything and I will -- it will show it was entered as of the time that I signed it.

MR. GALARDI: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Do we have any other business we need to take up this afternoon?

(No audible response)

THE COURT: All right. I wish you luck with your sale.

MR. GALARDI: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. FOLEY: Thank you again for accommodating with

all that flexibility over this week.

THE COURT: Very good.

THE CLERK: All rise. The court is now adjourned.

* * * * *

5

1

2

3

4

CERTIFICATION

I, CECILIA ASHBOCK, court approved transcribers, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter, and to the best of my ability.

<u>/s/ Cecilia Ashbock</u>

CECILIA ASHBOCK

DATE: March 5, 2009

J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC.